

**ENCLOSURE**  
**COMMENTS ON VCAPCD PROPOSED PERMITS NO. 0990 AND 1492**

**I. Comments applicable to both proposed permits**

1. The periodic monitoring included in these two permits is inadequate to assure compliance with applicable requirements. In many cases, the only requirement was for the source to perform “routine surveillance,” with no mention of methods or frequency. While non-compliance may be readily determined by routine surveillance for a simple piece of equipment, more complex equipment may not easily lend themselves to such casual periodic monitoring. Furthermore, one reason for conducting periodic monitoring is to minimize the exceedance of an applicable limit; waiting until non-compliance becomes obvious would be self-defeating, as a violation of the permit has already occurred. In cases where a specific test is not required, some minimum frequency of surveillance should be required to ensure compliance (e.g.: “inspection of this equipment shall occur no less than once per week.”) In addition, EPA requests that additional information justifying any monitoring that does not include testing methods be submitted with all Title V permits. This information could be a reference to an Engineering Report or other calculations, or a brief statement of explanation of the District’s reasoning.
2. The proposed Part 70 permits do not contain a condition to require that all applicable reports be certified and submitted to the District every six months, in accordance with VCAPCD Rule 33.3.A.3 and 40 CFR 70.6(a)(3). Requirements that information be submitted at the request of the District may remain in the equipment-specific conditions, since the District may wish to retain the ability to review records from the source more often than every six months.
3. The proposed permits utilize a format and organization that is sometimes difficult to follow. The permits use a “rule based” approach to including applicable requirements. This makes it difficult to derive a clear picture of the source, its overall operations, and particularly specific emission units. The use of tables to provide information on emissions limits, emissions units, and corresponding regulations, is useful as a distillation of pertinent information. However, it is difficult make a clear link between a particular emission unit and a permit condition when the conditions are essentially the applicable rules written in a generic format cross-referenced to the table. In other words, the conditions refer to things like “an applicable emission unit” rather than “the 4 MMbtu/hr Uniflux Heater.” Furthermore, the underlying logic for the monitoring conditions is difficult to ascertain when no engineering evaluation is included. An engineering evaluation or technical support document can be of great use in providing the context and rationale by which permit conditions are written. Also, it provides a clear link to the underlying logic of why a particular monitoring regime is used, and thus makes a determination of whether such a regime is adequate to ensure compliance easier.
4. The last sentence in the first paragraph of Section 4 is incorrect. VCAPCD’s SIP

approved Rule 29 (1982) is federally enforceable. The latest version of Rule 29 (which is non SIP-approved), however, is not federally enforceable.

5. In general, the District should use specific terms when referring to the source in the permit conditions, such as the “permittee” or the source’s actual name instead of “person,” so that there is no dispute as to the applicability and enforceability of the permit conditions with regard to the source.
6. There is a table in Section 2 that lists requirements of Section 7 that are applicable to each piece of equipment. It would also be helpful to know which requirements in Section 8 and 9 apply to each piece of equipment. It would also make the permit easier to comprehend if the “Applicability” portions of Sections 7-9 also contained this information. There are rules listed under “Applicability” in these Sections that do not apply to this facility. An explicit list of which rules apply, as well as the equipment to which they apply, would save EPA, the source, or any member of the public from having make this determination from other information. Numbering the tables in the permit would also be helpful for reference purposes.

## **II. Facility-specific comments**

### **A. Cal Resources LLC/Sespe Compressor Plant ( Permit Number 0990)**

#### **1. Monitoring Requirements to Ensure Compliance**

The following Conditions referring to “routine surveillance “ need to be revised to reflect specific requirements:

Attachment 71.4.B.1.a, Condition 4  
Attachment 71.5.B.1.a.1, Condition 5\*  
Attachment 50, Condition 2  
Attachment 52, Condition 2  
Attachment 57.B, Condition 3\*  
Attachment 68, Condition 2  
Attachment 71.1.C, Condition 3  
Attachment 71.4.B.1, Condition 2  
Attachment 74.6, Condition 12\*  
Attachment 74.10, Condition 5\*  
Attachment 74.1, Condition 7\*  
Attachment 74.2, Condition 5\*  
Attachment 40 CFR Part 61. M, Condition 3\*

Please note that those conditions marked with “\*” have some explanation of what constitutes “routine surveillance”. However, revisions to these will further clarify how routine surveillance will ensure compliance with the requirements.

#### *Section 7: Rule 71.1.B.1a*

1. The District has not incorporated into the proposed permit Condition 6 in the Permit to Operate Number 0990 to require that the vapor recovery system be “properly maintained and operated with a control efficiency of at least 90 percent.”
2. Condition 3. When a District rule is cross-referenced within a permit condition, i.e., Rule 74.10, the latest amendment date or District adoption date of the rule should be provided. This will make it clear with which version of the rule the source must comply if the rule is amended or changed in the future.

#### *Section 7: Rule 71.5*

1. Condition 3. The requirement that the emission control system shall be maintained in a “leak-free” condition does not appear enforceable as a practical matter, as the definition of “leak-free” is not provided in the Condition, nor is the term defined in Rule 71.5. The

District should either reference or incorporate into Condition 3 the definition of this term from the applicable requirement.

2. Condition 5. The Condition does not provide adequate periodic monitoring to assure compliance with Rule 71.5.B.3 for “leak-free.” If the term “leak” has the same definition as that provided in Rule 71 where determination sampling is performed according to an EPA method, routine surveillance would not qualify as an acceptable periodic monitoring requirement sufficient to yield reliable data from the relevant time period that are representative of the source’s compliance with the permit condition.

*Section 9: Rule 57.B*

1. Condition 3. It is unclear why this Condition should be included, since it does not appear that any equipment at the plant is fired on diesel fuel. If it is possible to switch from one fuel to another, i.e., natural gas to oil, then the District should re-examine all conditions in this section to ensure that adequate periodic monitoring has been added to assure compliance with applicable requirements during oil combustion. If the equipment cannot burn oil, but the source is limited to burning natural gas only, the District must insert a condition stating clearly this limitation.

*Section 9: Rule 64*

1. Condition 3. The Condition should specify the frequency of fuel sulfur content analysis. If the equipment is limited to firing natural gas only, a requirement to maintain records, i.e., vendor certification could be sufficient to assure compliance with the Rule. As with other types of “routine surveillance,” the frequency of this analysis should be explicitly stated in the permit (see comment above also).

*Section 9: Rule 68*

1. Conditions 1 and 2. It is unclear whether compliance with Rule 74.9.B.1 (CO emissions not to exceed 4500 ppmvd referenced at 15% oxygen) would assure compliance with Rule 68 (CO emissions not to exceed 2000 ppmvd at standard conditions). Therefore, the District must either provide an analysis to prove that compliance with Rule 74.9.B.1 results in compliance with Rule 68 or add periodic monitoring sufficient to yield reliable data from the relevant time period that are representative of the source’s compliance with the permit conditions.

*Section 9: Rule 74.10*

1. Condition 4. The District should add a statement to the last paragraph of this Condition to clarify that a reduction in monitoring frequency is not effective until the permittee receives a written approval from the APCO, pursuant to Rule 74.10.C.4.

**B. Torch Operating Company (Permit No. 1492)**

## 1. Monitoring Requirements to Ensure Compliance

The following Conditions referring to “routine surveillance “ need to be revised to reflect specific requirements:

Attachment 71.1.C, Condition 3  
Attachment 71.1N1, Condition 4  
Attachment 71.1N6, Condition 4  
Attachment 71.4.B.1, Condition 2  
Attachment 71.4.B.3, Condition 3  
Attachment 71.4N1, Condition 4  
Attachment 71.5N1, Condition 5\*  
Attachment 74.1, Condition 7\*  
Attachment 74.2, Condition 5  
Attachment 74.6, Condition 12  
Attachment 74.9N9, Condition 4  
Attachment 74.10, Condition 5\*  
Attachment 74.15.1N1, Condition 5\*  
Attachment 74.22, Condition 4  
Attachment 50, Condition 2  
Attachment 52, Condition 2  
Attachment 57.B, Condition 3\*  
Attachment 68, Condition 2

Please note that those conditions marked with “\*” have some explanation of what constitutes “routine surveillance”. However, revisions to these will further clarify how routine surveillance will ensure compliance with the requirements.

## 2. General Comments and Suggestions for Permit Improvement

Specific applicable requirements - It appears that the permit includes language from requirements that are not applicable to units at the source. Including extraneous requirements in the proposed permit creates confusion as to which requirements are applicable and which are not. For example, the following conditions from Section 7 do not appear relevant to this facility:

- Attachment 71.5N1 refers to Rule 71.5 on glycol dehydrators with heat input ratings between 1 MMBtu/hr to 5 MMBtu/hr and higher than 5 MMBTU. The equipment list in Section 2 shows that the glycol reboiler at the source has a heat input rating of 0.16 MMBtu/hr. If the table is correct, this rule is not applicable.
- Condition 9.a on medical devices, and Condition 9.g on aerospace related activities are listed in Attachment 74.6. It is unclear how these requirements apply to this source.
- Attachment 74.22 is applicable to Natural Gas-Fired Fan-Type Central Furnaces. No such

unit is listed in the permit.

An explanation of the relevance and applicability of the requirements is needed if indeed they are applicable to this facility. If not, they should be removed from the permit.

### 3. Presentation of Tables

As presented, the table of Permitted Equipment and Applicable Requirements in Section 2 does not provide all applicable requirements such as those listed in Section 9. Thus, the column for additional requirements only partially lists these requirements. A note on this matter can clarify that there are other additional requirements not listed in this table. Further, a footnote on referencing to “PC#” will help in locating the requirements.